

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/629,925	07/30/2003	Harald Moschutz	ZTP01P12002	1935	
24131	7590 06/01/2005	•	EXAM	EXAMINER	
LERNER AND GREENBERG, PA			O MALLEY, KATHRYN S		
P O BOX 24 HOLLYWO	80 OD, FL 33022-2480		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,	•	3749	-	
			DATE MAILED: 06/01/200	DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	·					
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments		10/629,925	MOSCHUTZ ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Kathryn S. O'Malley	3749			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repreply within the statutory minimum of thirty (iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHUM, tute, cause the application to become ABAI	ly be timely filed  30) days will be considered timely.  IS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2005.						
	his action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)[	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5\⊠	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 6, 7, 11-17, and 21 is/are allowed.</li> </ul>					
_	Claim(s) <u>6, 7, 77-17, and 27</u> is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-10 and 18-20</u> is/are rejected.					
· —	Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
_	ion Papers		·			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum  2. Certified copies of the priority docum  3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been re	plication No			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen		🗖				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Infori	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/629,925 Page 2

Art Unit: 3749

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. Applicant argues that, "The holding rack of Takeyama is enclosed on three sides and only provides access from the front side." And that Takeyama does not disclose, "a side defining at least one further access orifice," as recited in claims 1, 18, 19, and 20. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Both major sides of air permeable surfaces 51, 52, 53, and 9 have a plurality of holes. While admittedly, the holes are two small to allow insertion of most laundry articles, as taught in the present specification, it is noted that such a limitation is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, as the holes are large enough to serve as access orifices for smaller articles, such as the fingers of a user, as well as allowing access for air, it is deemed that the holes meet the broad claim limitation of, "at least one further access orifice."

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/629,925 Page 3

Art Unit: 3749

2. Claims 1-5, 8, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent 4,307,096 to Takeyama.

3. Takeyama teaches a laundry dryer with rotatable drum 1 and stationary drying rack comprising grilled surfaces bottom 51, sides 52, rear 53, and top 9 wherein the side and rear surfaces are connected to one another by pivoting hinges 55, enabling inner access at all surface edges, and the rack is connected to the drum with fastening devices 8. Note Figures 2, 3, and 8 and the first full paragraph of page 3 of Applicant's Remarks filed 2 September 2004.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeyama, as applied to claim 8 above.
- 6. Takeyama does not teach the thickness ratio claimed. However, such a limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 3749

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,374,644 to Rhode et al.

8. Takeyama does not teach surfaces with netting and a frame. Rhode et al. teaches a similar laundry rack comprising opposing parallel planes 22 and 20 formed of a wire mesh with a frame. Note column 5, lines 46-55 and Figure 1. As Rhode et al. teaches that mesh with a frame will provide a safe and effective barrier for laundry being treated in a rotary drum, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the drying rack of Takeyama with the opposing surfaces comprised of mesh and frame taught by Rhode et al.

## Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 6, 7, 11-17, and 21 are allowed.

### Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3749

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn S. O'Malley whose telephone number is (571)272-4879. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on (703)308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CHERYL TYLER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**KSO**